

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
	11/05/2001	Yoshitaka Hayashi	XA-9573	4070
7590	08/25/2004		EXAMINER	
TOCKB	RIDGE PC		LEWIS, T	TISHA D
CLE DR	IVE		APTIBIT	PAPER NUMBER
VA 2210	12_3833			FAFER NUMBER
	7590 STOCKB ACLE DR		11/05/2001 Yoshitaka Hayashi 7590 08/25/2004 STOCKBRIDGE PC ACLE DRIVE	11/05/2001 Yoshitaka Hayashi XA-9573 7590 08/25/2004 EXAM STOCKBRIDGE PC CLE DRIVE ART UNIT

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/985,669	HAYASHI ET AL.	
Advisory Action			,
	Examiner TISHA D. LEWIS	Art Unit	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	<u> </u>	3681	
THE REPLY FILED 23 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Apperexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	IIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION IN	ON FOR ALLOWAN cation. A proper re ch places the appli ely filed Request fo	NCE. ply to a cation in or Continued
event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The datave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened by above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date on FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI to on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the distatutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. 136(a) and the appropriate fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or	See MPEP te extension fee dension fee under (2) as set forth in
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s): 102(b).		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) 1 and 67 wo amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s)		a separate, timely f	ïled
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Section 1.		sidered but does No	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:		
Claim(s) allowed: 1,47,65 and 67.			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 2-11, 13-18, 20-22, 28, 41-46, 66,	68-74 and 97 (due to claims 2-4, 1	5, 20, 21, 41-45, 68,	69 and 72
depending from the allowable claims (see con't).			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	60	
10. Other:	- 0	TISHA LEWIS	5
	P	RIMARY EXAMINE	193/04

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's amendment to claim 28 and addition of new claim 97 is still not patentable over Cotterman in view of Teske et al. Applicant's argument as to the lacking of motivation in both references is acknowledged, but one would not have to reconstruct Cotterman to use the ball screw device of Teske since Teske discloses that ball screw actuators can be used in many different environments for positioning and movement purposes. The motivation for the combination of these references is inherently disclosed in Teske (i.e., positioning purposes).

1 and 67 and the rejected claims 28 and 97, these claims and other claims depending therefrom are still rejected. Applicant may want to consider changing the dependency of the claims back to the way they were before this amendment, changing claim 28 back to a dependent claim and deleting claim 97, the withdrawn claims may be rejoined according to applicant's response to this advisory.

PRIMARY EXAMINE